



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Klamath River Fishery Resource Office

P.O. Box 1006

Yreka, CA 96097-1006

(916) 842-5763

fax (916) 842-4517

June 6, 1994

Memorandum

TO: Klamath Fisheries Task Force

FROM: Project Leader, Klamath River FRO
Yreka, California

SUBJECT: Minutes of the recent Task Force meetings

Attached, for your review, are the draft minutes of the April 19-20 Task Force meeting in Brookings, and the May 4 teleconference. Please note that we have attached a handout you have not yet seen (Handout L) on projects funded by the ERO.

Ronald A. Iverson

Attachments

Klamath Fisheries Task Force
April 19-20, 1994
Brookings Inn, Brookings, OR

1. Convene meeting

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am by Rod McInnis with a quorum of members present (Attachment 1). Members introduced themselves. Shake and Hillman arrived later.

2. Discussion/adoption of agenda

Minor revisions to speakers listed on the agenda (Attachment 2) were made. The speakers listed below presented the information.

**** Motion (Wilkinson): Adopt the agenda as amended.

Seconded.

**** Consensus.

3. Correction/approval of minutes from February 1994 meeting

Orcutt noted that Joe "Mimbrino" should be spelled "Membrino."

**** Motion (Holder): Adopt minutes with the noted correction.

Seconded.

**** Consensus.

4. Report of the Bureau of Reclamation on 1994 Klamath River water outlook and operational plans (Mike Ryan)

Mike emphasized that the flows into Upper Klamath Lake are the 5th lowest on record (Handouts A and B). The graph shows inflows that are behind 1991 and 1992 inflows. The table from Soil Conservation Service (SCS) shows us that Upper Klamath Lake is the major water supplier for the Klamath River. For all three reservoirs combined, we have a 50/50 chance of adding 50% of average runoff for the water year. SCS predicts this based on the snowpack as of April 1.

The Klamath Compact Commission thought we had 25,000-35,000 acre feet (ac) reserved for fisheries, but with the help of the refuges and water users we now have more water available than that.

Q: What is the process that Bureau of Reclamation uses to arrive at its allocation scenarios? do you take into account the trust responsibilities?

A: Yes. We try to find a year in recent history that it looks like this year's precipitation scenario will mimic. So far, it looks like the rainfall pattern this year is similar to the '91 water year.

Q: What percent will be available for Federal Energy Regulation Commission (FERC) requirements and what percent will be available to water users (Orcutt)?

A: I don't have that information right now. I will get it to you.

Q: Does the 25,000-35,000 af equate to an increase above 550 cfs?

A: The schedule that we are looking at from Iron Gate Dam is a base of 550 cfs. We have two outmigration events scheduled that will use a total of 15,000 - 16,000 af. After September, we are looking at 900 cfs flowing from Iron Gate Dam to help with adults returning. These flows are benefitted by the water conservation efforts of the refuge and agricultural users.

Q: Once the water year is up, how do you propose that there will be enough flows for spawning and preventing the redds from being dewatered?

A: We intend to reach the FERC flow requirement of 1,300 cfs at least 75-80% of the time throughout the winter. We need guidance from you folks on how much water is needed for salmonids during which times of the year.

Q: How receptive are you to the need for monitoring?

A: I am very concerned.

Q: The temperature criteria for the water in the Trinity River needs to continue out to the estuary to truly help the fish. Are you planning to coordinate this aspect of water management too?

A: Yes, and I will work even harder with lower basin concerns in the future.

5. Report of Pacific Power on 1994 operating plans (Tim O'Connor)

I'm the hydro-superintendent for Pacific Power. We have had difficulties with non-compliance with the FERC requirements for instream flow at Iron Gate Dam. Currently, we are directed to hold Iron Gate releases at 550 cfs to try to capture any additional inflow. During the period between March 10-April 13 3,500 af of additional storage was captured using this reduced flow.

Q: Iron Gate Reservoir has 55,000 af of storage and Copco has 77,000 af of storage, but your existing hardware and discharge plans set aside some water that is not designed to be used. If we could get half of that dead storage released into the river it could be really helpful for improving water quality. Could we look into tapping into the lower, colder water for future years?

A: Yes, we could look into this.

Bulfinch: Perhaps there is a way to get 15,000 af of cold water out of Copco Reservoir and run it to Iron Gate to help the hatchery have enough cold water to operate more effectively. I am asking about mixing the flows/using the cold water from 50 ft deep in the reservoir (10°C) to lower the temperature in the mainstem Klamath River. Last year, the mainstem Klamath's water temperature in August was 22°C all the way down to Beaver Creek. This cold water could be mixed with the rest of the tributary flows to lower the temperature 5-6 degrees. The positive benefits of this would be felt downriver to at least Beaver Creek; it would provide a cushion of better habitat for redd protection. I urge that we take a look at the availability of this colder water.

O'Connor: This is a good idea.

6. Report on effects of 1994 water operations on endangered species (Fish & Wildlife Service)

Steve Lewis, ERO project supervisor: Today, I will speak on the relationship between water operations and life history of endangered suckers. Mark Buettner, the Bureau of Reclamation's fishery biologist, provided this information to me. This year, suckers began spawning on March 6 and peaked on March 15. Successful hatch and swim-up was documented on April 1. Spawning success was rated as fair for the suckers; which consisted mostly of Lost River suckers. The main point is that Bureau of Reclamation met the lake level elevation of 4,141 prior to their goal date of March 1.

Q: Is there any level at which the lake should be maintained to protect the juveniles through their first year?

A: (Ryan) The recovery plan addresses water level needs for spawning and juvenile rearing. 4,141 is needed for spawning, then until swim-up occurs (30 days later) the lake needs to be kept within one foot of the spawning level. In the fall, the lake can go below 4,139 but not below 4,137. This fall, it looks like the lake will drop below 4,139 unless we have a wet summer. If it is decreased more than a foot, we will have mortality.

7. Report of California Department of Fish and Game on planned releases from Iron Gate Hatchery (Rich Elliott)

Rich described the coho and chinook planned releases for 1994 (Handout C). When coho were released in March, the flows in the Klamath were only about half of the FERC requirement. The fingerling releases planned for this year are similar to what they have been for the past few years. The number of coded wire tags is also similar to past years.

Q: How were the planting dates for fingerling chinook coordinated with pulse flows from Iron Gate?

A: We planned and succeeded in having the spring planting dates and the pulse flows coincide. There will be two more early summer pulses after the fish are released to help them get downriver.

Q: The coho release occurred at a time when flows were about half of the FERC requirement. Did these low flows also have high water temperatures?

A: Rode: The temperature problem did not exist this year as it did last year. The gravel bar that led to temperature problems last year has been breached.

8. Report of fishery agencies on their perspectives on 1994 Klamath River operation: Official responses to water management proposals; fish outmigration monitoring plans; other planned actions (all involved tribes and agencies).

CDFG

Rode: As reviewed earlier, we did make a request for 4 pulse flows during May, June and Sept. The flows during each of these pulses added up to 36,300 ac ft. If an additional 20,000 ac ft becomes available we will be in even better shape to facilitate outmigration. We have three recommendations for the Task Force to consider: 1) We feel that there is a monitoring need for continuation of the rotary screw trap at Big Bar; perhaps Bureau of Reclamation could help out with funding so that this can continue, 2) We have also identified a monitoring site at the mouth of the Scott River, 3) Activities such as the mainstem monitoring program conducted by the U S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) last year are worthwhile and should be continued, 4) We feel that the river needs a water quality monitoring program; perhaps we could put together an interagency/tribal team to collect information on water quality and temperature.

- o We need to include cumulative impact studies with these in-river investigations. Perhaps the in-river studies could be expanded to identify site specific problem areas (e.g. thermal barriers, non-point pollution).
- o As we do water quality inventories, we could flag potential problems. Modelling efforts may be more time consuming than we can do right now, but we can at least start collecting data.

Hoopla Tribe

Orcutt: On the Trinity side, we have the flow study in place and studies underway for identifying the optimum number of fish. On the Klamath side, I want to clarify that the Tribe is supportive of the flow study and the proposal put together by Thomas. The dialogue with upper basin interests has really improved too.

Robert Franklin, Hydrologist for Hoopa Valley Tribe: We have already suffered some direct impacts of water management this year. Dewatered redds have already occurred and some water is going out of basin to the Rogue River. We need to find out more about this out of basin transfer. We also need clear

objectives on the pulse flows (e.g. are the pulses sized or timed in order to meet temperature criteria?) Overall, the impacts have not spread to the various sectors that use water in a balanced fashion. We need an ongoing planning effort. Since we met minimum lake levels early this year, I don't understand why extra water wasn't diverted downstream for salmonid benefits.

Department of Interior

Iverson: The Service has drafted a letter on the subject of 1994 Klamath River operation. When that letter is signed, we will distribute it to the Task Force. At a meeting in Sacramento a few days ago, we saw disturbing water quality data from Klamath Straits drain. A report on this will be available in about six months. I recommend that it be an agenda item for an upcoming Task Force meeting.

If you have developed monitoring proposals that were submitted for consideration of FY95 funding, please speak about them today. The letter on funding the fish trapping monitoring program is available (Handout D) and Jim Craig will speak on it.

Jim Craig, Fishery Biologist, Coastal California Fisheries Resource Office (CCFRO): As our funding for monitoring activities runs out, we will stop trapping yearlings at Big Bar. We have submitted FY95 proposals for funding more traps near the confluence with the Scott River, Salmon River and 45 miles downstream at Big Bar. We have also submitted a proposal to continue the mainstem spawner monitoring that we did this year. If these are funded, we will be able to monitor what impact the flows are having on the fish. Funds don't exist for spring trapping because we have had changes in the office that used up the funding that was available.

- o Fletcher: There should not be any question on where the money for monitoring is coming from. The funding should be ascertained ahead of time.

Yurok Tribe

Fletcher: Our main concern is that the population of the fishery is at minimal or sub-minimal levels (Handout E). When we drop below the minimums it is to the detriment of the resource. We also want to see a process for arriving at water allocations. Is it scientific? Does it include the life history of fish? Tribal trust obligations? The recent Department of Interior (DOI) decision laid out the details on harvest. We need to have a similar clear cut process on water allocations. There needs to be a vehicle for better communication with water users. I also want to emphasize the need for monitoring as a cost of doing business.

U S Forest Service

Holder: We have not put together an official response on our agency's perspective of '94 Klamath River water operations.

Julie Perrochet, Klamath National Forest, Forest Fishery Biologist: We are addressing biological needs which is a good start. We may not be addressing the geomorphological needs as much as we should be. We are looking at cumulative effects using remote sensing (e.g., thermal bands) and videography. We are working with Utah State University on this "up and coming" research tool. We will be working with Bob Rohde as much as we can. We support the mainstem spawning studies and the monitoring efforts. We will also be working with Rohde on temperature monitoring efforts. The Happy Camp Ranger District will be operating an outmigrant trap on Elk Creek. We will continue with the spring chinook/summer steelhead survey and the fall spawning survey. We also have an integrated stream inventory that will be done on the smaller streams (working with range scientists on habitat conditions).

Q: Are you coordinating with other agencies on the videography flights?

A: The first flight was done on the Salmon river. We sent out a letter announcing this program (to people on our interest group list) for the test case. I can add the Yurok Tribe to the list. The meeting is today in Yreka. Videography was first used on the Virgin River in Utah. Soon, we will be reaching out to other agencies, such as Bureau of Reclamation, to assess the need for and uses of information such as this. Right now, we are just working on the test runs. We can provide written evaluation of our tests to the Task Force when they are available.

Q: It is my understanding that U S Forest Service has cumulative impacts study in their forest plan. Is there a way to incorporate this into the videography study?

A: The cumulative impacts study will be a cooperative effort. None of our cumulative impacts models have been tested, but as soon as they are, we will be using them. The Klamath National Forest is on the cutting edge.

Q: Are other water quality factors being addressed to assist outmigration in addition to the pulsing flows?

A: Rode: There have been a number of studies done (e.g. on the Stanislaus River and the Yakima River), showing that pulse flows cause the fish to move out. This downstream movement is a result of a physical increase in the amount of water flowing downstream. Doubling the flow in the Klamath will cause the fish to move out to the estuary. It doesn't take a long duration of high flows, but it does take a big pulse of water. We try to coordinate the pulse flows with hatchery releases and then we also coordinate with natural fish by waiting a reasonable amount of time for fish to get out of the tributaries.

Karuk Tribe

Hillman: Good points have been raised today in terms of monitoring needs especially in terms of the low flows that we will be experiencing. Our tribe has been coordinating with the other tribes and agencies involved in these monitoring efforts. I anticipated that Bob Rohde would have provided information on the Karuk Tribe's perspective -- he may provide this information at a later meeting.

In-river sportfishing community

Bulfinch: I am disturbed that funding for basic monitoring is not occurring. These proposals need to be separated from proposals for additional funding. I want to repeatedly emphasize my request to Pacific Power and Bureau of Reclamation to tap the cool water that exists at the bottom of the reservoirs prior to trying to get it some other way.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Wilkinson: There has been a significant amount of information gathered on pulse flows on the Rogue River. It seems like it is a good time to coordinate this information between the two states.

National Marine Fisheries Service

McInnis: The official comment from National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the flow issue is still in preparation. We are continually concerned about flows for fall chinook spawning escapement.

Q: Bulfinch: One of the factors contributing to the decline has been attributed to ocean conditions and activities in the ocean. Are there any studies being done on ocean survival of the smolts that are pulsed out of the system? Do we know?

A: McInnis: The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) received a report on the outlook for ocean conditions. Ocean conditions have been unfavorable for salmon because they are not as productive as they need to be. The worst part has been north of here. California has had good survival conditions for chinook.

Q: Will a letter to the Secretary of Interior be put together this year, like the one that was put together last year (regarding flows)?

A: Orcutt: The PFMC has restructured the habitat committee to include seats from the Fish & Wildlife Service, Tribes, and States. One of the agenda items that they will consider is putting together another letter to the Secretary of Interior.

Lunch

Shake resumed the Chair position at the meeting.

10. Public Comment

Jim Welter, Klamath Coalition, Oregon South Coast Fishermen, Port of Brookings: Fish from the Klamath River are very important to us. We think that the mainstem spawning survey done by the Arcata office of Fish and Wildlife Service was very important. Please consider funding this type of study over a full life cycle. My feeling is that if you put big, healthy fish out in the ocean, they will survive.

Ann Ramp, represents nobody, doesn't fish, listens at fish meetings: I had intended to say here today, "When are you going to get the agencies together enough to work together?" Now, I'm questioning why we are several years into restoring the Klamath River and we are just now getting into doing the basic

research that needs to be done (e.g. monitoring). What can we the public do to help you with your process?

Bob Jones, resident of Brookings: I am concerned with the charter that says for you to restore the fisheries in the Klamath basin. I am not convinced that there is enough water to meet all the needs of all the users in the basin. Your responsibility is to restore the fishery. So, if you think the fish need water, you need to get more adamant with your actions.

11. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments related to 1994 Klamath River water operations.

** Motion (Orcutt): the Klamath Basin Task Force recognizes the urgent need to alter long-term instream flow management below Iron Gate Dam. To this end, we recommend the following:

1. Flow releases must be managed in accordance with Federal Trust Responsibilities to all basin tribes. Accordingly, Federal reserved fishing and water rights must be protected in times of shortage in order to ensure meaningful exercise of tribal fishing rights.
2. Flow releases must be managed in accordance with public trust responsibilities of the States of California and Oregon. Further, Klamath Basin fishery assets must be protected in times of shortage in order to ensure the health of Klamath Basin anadromous fish populations.
3. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation must use the best available scientific information (including minimum flows established for Iron Gate Dam by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission), in developing operating criteria and procedures for the Klamath Project.

** Motion tabled.

12. Report from the Klamath Fishery Management Council on 1994 salmon harvest management: estimated chinook and coho stock abundance; measures taken to protect depleted natural stocks; anticipated spawning escapements. (Wilkinson)

The results of this year's meetings produced options that provide for: 1) meeting the escapement floor of 35,000 naturally spawning fall chinook, 2) 50:50 sharing between tribal/non-tribal interests, 3) 88%:12% sharing between ocean and in-river recreational harvest, and 4) the coho constraint (2.54% exploitation of Oregon coast natural (OCN) coho in Klamath Management Zone (KMZ) recreational fisheries with an overall OCN coho exploitation rate of 11.19%). The Klamath Council also considered north of the zone/south of the south zone sharing of recreational harvest impacts this year because of coho constraints. An important item to remember is that the KMZ recreational season is designed differently than in the past (i.e., there will not be a constraint of 6 fish in 7 days). There was also a decision for 17% of Klamath harvest to go to zone fisheries, and of this, 12% went to in-river recreational fishing.

The April 5, 1994 issue of the Council News (PFMC) shows the economic impacts of the '94 salmon fishery:

The total revenue from the West Coast non-treaty ocean troll fisheries is expected to be 37% below the '93 level of \$7.9 million and about 90% below the 1976-1993 average of \$43.7 million. Hardest hit will be the areas north of Point Arena, all of which are expected to be at least 90 percent below the 1976-1993 average, including the total closure north of Cape Falcon. The fishery south of Point Arena is expected to be 70% below the 1976-1993 average. Because 1993 troll fisheries were severely restricted, the declines expected for 1994 when compared to 1993 are less dramatic but still significant.

Total income associated with West Coast recreational fisheries is expected to be about 50% below the 1993 level of \$21.6 million and about 70% below the 1976-1993 average of \$37.9 million.

13. Task Force discussion

Fletcher: The Yurok Tribe is experiencing similar economic hardships. We will not have a commercial fishery in '94 and we will just barely meet our minimum needs.

Orcutt: The Hoopa Valley Tribe asked to have deficit accounting adopted last fall. Without getting into a lot of debate about the floor, the management option that was adopted provided for a floor of 35,000. We feel that having enough natural spawners to protect sub-basin stocks (such as those in the Shasta River) is extremely important. The decision by the Secretary of Commerce reaffirms the tribes reserved fishing right. This will be further defined by the courts.

Fletcher: The Yurok Tribe is also concerned about stocks of concern. We have managed our fisheries with in-season closures and other management actions to lessen impacts on stocks at risk. Everybody needs to lessen their risk wherever they can.

McInnis: For the past four years, harvest management options have resulted in a failure to meet the 35,000 spawning escapement floor. This year, changes have been made in the forecasting model to try to prevent this from happening again. This adjustment has been made and the forecast is now more conservative. The other change is that the hatchery and natural components of the run are now predicted differently. We now have a better way of partitioning the contribution. The natural component is now estimated at 47% of the run. The older method would have given us 52%. The impact of that is that we need to get more fall chinook into the river to meet the floor escapement level. Back to Keith's points on the economic impact, the ocean troll fishery is impacted all the way to the Mexican border.

Wilkinson: The projected number of fish needed to achieve the 35,000 natural chinook spawning floor is 66,800 adults returning to the river.

Shake: I believe that we can restore fish runs without cutting out all harvest of fish. We need to have good habitat available so that when the drought and el Nino end we can have a rebound of stocks.

14. Public comment

Jim Welter: We have healthy stocks of coho here, so any fishing that is done is going to impact them.

15. Action: Task Force decisions, assignments, and advice to the Klamath Council

Shake: Are there any possible actions the Task Force wants to take in regards to Klamath Council actions?

- o We could work with the Klamath Council to ensure adequate spawners are available (Shake).
- o The option of spawner deficit accounting is still up for discussion. The Klamath Council will be meeting via teleconference on May 23 to forward a recommendation or non-recommendation on including this method in the Pacific Council's process.

16. Report on the Klamath Symposium

Orcutt: George Kautsky, a fishery biologist for the Hoopa Tribe, was one of the primary planners for this event (Handout F). Other people also helped plan (CDFG, USFWS, BR, etc). This symposium was planned in order to provide a forum for identifying biological constraints, such as water management, habitat management, and ocean survival. We wanted to provide a setting to look to the future for the fishery resources in the Klamath Watershed as well as provide a forum to develop solutions to those challenges. Proceedings will be printed by the National Biological Survey (NBS) in Arcata (Tom Hassler) and should be available in the next few months. In the future, the conference will be strengthened by having more of an emphasis on future management. We thank all the funding agencies who helped to put this event together.

Shake: Many of us here today attended the symposium. It was an effective forum to hear about the biological issues and then look to possible management solutions. The symposium planners should be congratulated.

17. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Coordination between Trinity River restoration/flow evaluation efforts and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act

Orcutt: This agenda item is related to the reauthorization of the Trinity Program. Early in the history of the Trinity Program was a recognition that the area between Lewiston and Grass Valley Creek needed to be restored prior to restoration work on the mainstem getting underway. Grass Valley Creek has had many restoration activities done since this time: Buckhorn Dam was built to catch sediment, sediment catchment ponds were built, and lands have been purchased by Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Now, on the mainstem, side

channels have been built and bank feathering has been done to provide rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids. At the Trinity Task Force meeting in September, there was a public outcry against bank feathering (Handout G) that later led to a cease and desist order by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Now they are deciding if a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA) is warranted. As far as the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) goes, there is specific reference to the trust responsibility of the tribes to insure that the flows in the Trinity are adequate.

Franklin: NEPA is the key to much of the upcoming decisions that will need to be made. Under that umbrella, we have a Trinity flows EIS (1986), then an EIS for the Trinity River restoration program. There is a lot of coordination between these different decision making arenas. We have a slow down on one aspect of the Trinity Project now that a decision has been made to go with an EIS. On the other hand, this EIS will bring good information.

Q: The Hoopa Tribe seems to have good input on the water management scenario for the Trinity River. Can you draw any similarities between the Klamath and the Trinity?

A: Both rivers have federal water projects. The Trinity's issues came up for discussion and action longer ago than the issues on the Klamath. There have been no deviations on the flows in the Trinity from what the Secretary of Interior decided a few years ago.

Lane: The Notice of Intent for the comprehensive EIS on Trinity flows will be published this summer. The objective is to have a draft out for public review by 1995. This is scheduled to coincide with the final EIS on the CVPIA. The common thread in these two EIS's is flows for the Trinity.

18. Report on the March 23 meeting of the Four Chairs, and follow-up meeting on Trinity Restoration Program extension (Bill Shake)

The four chairs met to improve communication and coordination between the respective entities (Klamath Fisheries Task Force, Klamath Fishery Management Council, Trinity Task Force and Klamath Compact Commission). The primary purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the activities of the four groups to David Cottingham who is a special assistant to Betsy Rieke in the DOI. Rieke is the point person for salmon issues in DOI. One of the Secretary's objectives is to highlight the Klamath and Trinity basin as one of the examples of how ecosystem management can work. David's job was to report back to the Washington Office on how we are coordinating and how we should be improving communications for the use of other groups who are developing ecosystem management programs. One of the key messages that Cottingham received is that the Trinity Program needs reauthorization. The Klamath may need to be reauthorized at the same time, or have more funding allocated to it -- although this portion of the action is pending. The result of the meeting is that a group for rewriting the potential legislation was formed. Chip Bruss is the leader of this group.

Bruss: We held a meeting yesterday to attempt to re-draft the legislation. After two intense hours of trying to get everyone to agree, we decided that we don't agree. No decision was made on whether the proposed Trinity Task Force would operate by using consensus decision-making. We developed a matrix of possibilities (Handout H). We also discussed legitimizing the Four Chairs meeting by having it legislated (the fourth alternative in the matrix) and we discussed upper basin concerns. The wording in the proposed legislation would have to be very carefully crafted in order to preclude inclusion of upper basin folks, although not include them either (at this point). I will have another meeting soon to continue work on this issue. Let me know if any of you would like to see the compilation of comments that I receive on this legislation.

- o The approved minutes of the January 7 Trinity River Task Force meeting show the four items that they recommended changing in the new legislation (Handout H).
- o We also need to look at how these legislative changes would fit into the President's Plan (Holder).
- o All federal agencies have trust responsibilities. The tribes do not take these responsibilities lightly. We want discussions regarding our resources to be coordinated with us better in the future (Orcutt).

Q: If the Trinity legislation runs out in November, will Option 9 funding pick up where the legislative funding runs out?

A: Right now, Option 9 funds apply only to public lands.

- o In that case, I think that your request for reauthorization is well founded (Bulfinch).
- o The province system seems to make the most sense for managing the system.
- o I do not support alternative 5 on the matrix to abolish the programs. The Trinity Restoration Program needs to be expanded, not abolished (Shake).

19. Report of the ad hoc committee to draft a letter of support for Trinity program extension

Orcutt: In February, the Klamath Task Force named a subcommittee (Stokely, Farro and myself) to get together to draft a letter of support for the Trinity Restoration Program (Handout I). Most of the salmonid production occurs in the Trinity River.

Q: Is this draft letter a product of consensus?

A: Yes.

Fletcher: The Yurok Tribe would like to be considered separately from "other non-governmental organizations."

Shake: We need to be fairly general on this letter in order to get consensus on it.

- o Item #2, should read "Modification of the Task Force membership to broaden tribal and non-governmental organization representation."

Q: Do we want to limit ourselves to a five year extension? Shouldn't we be more broad?

A: Good idea. The second sentence in the second paragraph should read "...and an extension of the program."

- o The Hoopa Tribe wants to encourage the drafters of this letter to get it on the table soon. The Tribal Council endorses Program reauthorization.

Break

McInnis chairing meeting.

21. Task Force discussion

Fletcher: Item #2 can stay as shown. The letter needs to have a separate item that specifically names the Yurok Tribe.

Holder: I endorse tribal involvement, yet I feel uncomfortable naming one specific tribe.

McInnis: Amend letter to have a new #2 that reads: "Modification of Task Force membership to include membership of Klamath basin tribal governments." Item #3 would be the old Item #2. The other items would be numbered sequentially.

22. Public comment

None.

23. Task Force decisions and assignments

** Motion (Orcutt): The Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force endorses the amended supporting letter for reauthorization of the Trinity Restoration Program.

Seconded (Wilkinson).

Discussion

None.

**** Consensus.

**** Action: Staff will edit letter as discussed and provide to Shake for signature.

24. Report on status of Fiscal Year 1994 restoration projects

State Work Plan

Elliott: CDFG had 18 projects that totalled \$226,998 (Handout J). As the projects have been finalized we will actually be funding \$1,096 more than originally anticipated. We would like to have this additional money considered as part of the state matching funds.

** Motion (Wilkinson): Approve additional amount as part of the matching funds for the restoration program.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Q: What assumptions can we made about the other 14 projects?

A: The only projects that had funding changes are the ones shown on the cover letter. The other 14 projects are currently being executed for the original amount.

**** Consensus.

Federal Work Plan

Department of Interior: Klamath River Fishery Resource Office (KRFRO)

Iverson: The table labeled agendum #24 (Handout K) is the updated federal work plan. The column on the right describes the status of these projects.

Discussion

Fletcher: NCIDC indicated to me that they will be here to discuss two action items related to this workplan tomorrow.

Lara: One action item is related to project E-6 (curriculum development for grades K-3). Last June, we decided that we would fund this "as funds became available." The hang up is that funds may be available, but we need to have action one way or the other on the upper basin amendment to decide if the Tulana Farms project will be funded. Once the upper basin amendment issue is decided, the Tulana Farms project will either be funded or not so we will be able to see how much funding is available for project E-6. Right now \$21,000 is available for funding E-6, but the contractor says that \$35,000 is needed to make a useful product. The other action item relates to NCIDC's draft agreement.

Iverson: Proposed revisions to the draft agreement will change the project focus from an agreement for rearing fish to an agreement for a combination of rearing fish and constructing better facilities. Right now there is no "scope of work" for these revisions to the project. We understand that NCIDC will be coming to this meeting to talk to us to clarify what they want funding for. The project that they are asking to have funded now is different than the one the Technical Work Group reviewed and ranked. This change to the federally funded portion of the workplan is major because the intent of the project is different and because the pond rearing involves more than half of our grant money.

Department of Interior: Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office (ERO)

Lewis: Our level of funding has firmed up since I spoke to you in October. We know that we have \$900,000 for 10 projects to be funded through the BR. We also have \$131,000 in the Partners Program for projects such as fencing, wetland restoration, and protecting endangered species. The Fish and Wildlife Foundation has also provided some funding for 13 more projects. Overall, because of this year's short time frame, the projects that have been selected have already gone through the NEPA requirements. Next year we will go through a similar process to what the Klamath Task Force uses.

Q: Bulfinch: Couldn't the Tulana Farms project be funded by the ERO?

A: If the project you are referring to is the same one that I am familiar with, then it is being funded by the Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Q: Iverson: Steve, Can we get a handout on the projects funded through the ERO as an attachment to the notes?

A: Yes, I'll provide that to you (Handout L).

Department of Agriculture

Holder: The Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative is providing partial funding for the types of projects that the USFS has been doing all along. Right now we are in the midst of getting all the agencies on board to join with USFS and BLM to prepare watershed analyses of key watersheds under the President's Forest Plan. As the Local Interagency Interdisciplinary Team (LIIT) teams did their work to start servicing watersheds that were identified as key, a series of projects surfaced that totalled over \$5 million. \$3.2 million was available for use under the President's Forest Plan. These projects were forwarded to the Provincial Interagency Executive Committee (PIEC) teams, reviewed, then sent to the State Community Economic Revitalization Team (CERT) for approval a month ago. This all leads up to the preliminary watershed analysis that will be used as the basis for the Jobs in the Woods Program. The objective is to get jobs at the local level -- for example, 50% of this work needs to be road related (e.g. some of the projects are major contracts to rent local equipment). We still need to go through the NEPA process on this and we also need to take into consideration the special actions that will need to be carried out in regards to the Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet. Throughout the Pacific Northwest, we have identified 50

watersheds for analysis that will soon be narrowed down. The Klamath National Forest has been asked to take the lead in a provincial analysis. The Task Force Long Range Plan is providing a foundation for these reviews. We are adding terrestrial concerns to this foundation. My report covers just the activities on the federal side. Local entities have also nominated projects that will soon be funded.

Q: Wilkinson: How are the provinces designed to provide for interstate interests such as the Klamath?

A: The Klamath Province boundary surrounds the Klamath Watershed in California and Oregon.

Fletcher: I know that you are starting to look at how to include private lands into this project. Until private lands are included it is not a complete ecosystem.

Perrochet: When this program began, we knew that it would need to start with public lands then later expand to include private lands.

Hoopa Tribe

Orcutt: We are getting funding from Option 9 to work on the reservation too. We have 90,000 acres of land that is under the direct authority of the tribe, so the money spent here is different than the other money being spent on federal lands.

26. Public comment

Mary Taylor: I have heard talk now for over a year regarding this new funding that is to put displaced workers to work. It seems to me that many of the job descriptions are dead end jobs (e.g. trail work). At what point in time will the bigger picture be seen? If heavy equipment contractors are used, are they going to have to let their trained workers go -- in order to hire untrained workers who need a job? This sounds to me like you are going to have some big problems. There is nothing as scary to a private landowner as having people go onto their private land to do work. They are not going to hire inexperienced workers. I think that displaced workers should get themselves trained.

Holder: Federal contracting is a very careful process that follows a specific procedure. In certain counties, there are certain criteria that can give preference to using local workers. These type of things have not been done much in the past, but they could be done more in the future. There are at least 4 different types of procedures that could be used. This is not just a one time shot -- there will be a lot of training.

Franklin: speaking as a resident of Trinity County: Jobs in the Woods is about jobs, not about salmon. Remember that this whole idea was designed at the Washington D.C level, so it may not exactly achieve our goals out here in the field. I hope that those of you involved in it can implement it as best you can with the short time frames etc. You really have your job cut out for you.

28. Status of FY 1995 restoration program planning

Klamath Basin ERO (Lewis)

In a couple of weeks we will have the announcement out for developing FY95 projects. We will have \$130,000 available from the Partners for Wildlife Program, \$400,000 from the Fish and Wildlife Foundation and most likely \$1.5 million from BR. Recently, we heard that some money may also be coming through Ecological Services (\$32 million for private lands for FY95). In the future, we will set up a yearly funding pattern.

Klamath River FRO (Iverson)

Our period for receiving proposals for FY95 funding ended April 16. The Technical Work Group meets May 16-19, then the Budget subcommittee meets on May 20. The Budget subcommittee is chaired by Nat Bingham. Any interested Task Force members can participate.

Q: Is there any other money available?

A: We are still in line to get \$1 million of Congressionally appropriated money annually. We have also been pursuing EPA's 319h grant program funding - we have an approved proposal for restoration work on agricultural lands to reduce non-point pollution.

California Department of Fish and Game (Elliott)

We are still in the process of developing funding amounts for next year, so I could report more at the next meeting.

- o We need to see a formal process for approving state matching projects as part of the Klamath Restoration Program. If a project is rated low by the Technical Work Group (TWG), then later funded by California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) it undermines the work done by the TWG (Orcutt).
- o Rode: CDFG has a uniform ranking system on a regional level. After making it through the regional ranking system, proposals are submitted to each funding source where they are ranked according to the criteria for that source. Later, they are brought into the Task Force process for approval. It is inevitable that there might be a bit of mismatch, but by and large the proposals match up with the Klamath's workplan.

U.S. Forest Service (Holder)

The North West Economic Adjustment Initiative (NWEAI) should continue for 5 years. During that time, agency budgets should remain somewhat stable.

11. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments related to 1994 Klamath River water operations.

(continued from page 8)

Continued discussion

- o This issue should be dealt with by Del Norte and Siskiyou Counties.
- o The four tribes in the Klamath Watershed are seeking recognition of their federal trust responsibility. All federal agencies have a fiduciary responsibility to insure that the rights of the tribes are protected to insure that fish and flows survive. Endangered and sensitive fish need their interests looked out for, this can be done in the way that stream flows are managed (Orcutt).
- o The Solicitor's opinion lays out guidance for resources to be protected. This is consistent with the guidance for trust responsibility (Fletcher).
- o The Bureau of Reclamation also has an Indian Trust policy that states that BR will carry out activities to protect resources or provide appropriate mitigation (Orcutt).
- o Item 2 of the motion involves possible adjudications of Klamath and Shasta Rivers. Since there was a letter from county supervisors on January 25 (Handout M) that specifically requested input from Siskiyou County Supervisors on anything affecting the land base of Siskiyou County, I recommend that we table this motion until the county representatives can be present (Bulfinch).
- o I feel that it is important, on a biological basis, to be more aware of how the FERC standards are established. I would also like to be a lot more informed on this issue before voting (Holder).
- o My intent with this motion was to address the long term strategy of the issue of flows in the mainstem. In the short term, I wanted to get an answer to the question of what we could do for '94 operations (Orcutt).
- o I agree that we should become more educated on this issue and then present a well-founded argument to the BR (Shake).

**** Action:** Before we move forward with this motion, we need to:

- 1) Review the policies in the Long Range Plan that deal with flow.
- 2) Review draft motion point #1, because I don't know that this is true. (I question whether tribal trust responsibilities impact water law.)
- 3) Find a way to fund a flow study for FY95 (point #3). This assignment is to Orcutt and Fletcher, assisted by Yreka and Klamath Falls staff.

Iverson: There is nothing in the FY94 workplan for the flow study. The indication that we got from the Sacramento Field Office is that if there were a reasonable commitment of Task Force funds, then they would be available to make the flow study happen.

Holder: Perhaps we could have a discussion paper prepared by staff for the Task Force and Upper Basin representatives to review prior to the June meeting. Social perspectives would also need to be considered.

Public comment

Gary Hagedorn, Acting Refuge Director: I want to see that wetland habitats are adequately considered in the water issues dealt with by this Task Force.

Recessed.

April 20, 1994

24. Report on the status of Fiscal Year 1994 restoration projects (continued)

** Motion (Wilkinson): Fund the Tulana Farms project (HR-19) with ERO funding. Then use the KRFRO funds that were marked for the Tulana Farms project to fund the curriculum (E-06).

Seconded.

Discussion

- o Lewis will check to see if the project that the ERO is funding is the same one as the one that applied for Task Force funds.

**** Consensus.

30. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments relative to FY95 restoration program planning

Franklin: I need direction from the Task Force on projects that aren't rated high by the TWG, but then receive funding from the state that qualifies as the non-federal match. How are we going to deal with this in the future?

Shake: The TWG should make a recommendation on a low score that is below that considered "approved." These projects could be returned to the proposer telling them what the problem is.

** Assignment to TWG: Identify the problem then propose a written solution to the Task Force.

31. Update on the Forest Plan process; Final supplemental EIS and Record of Decision; Klamath Province Team; watershed analysis; Pacfish and more (Holder)
The Forest Plan process has made a new way of organizing government activities on forest lands. At the meeting in Arcata in February, I gave you a description of the new organization with its new regions, provinces and local levels. This whole process includes federal and state agencies, tribes and has opportunities for public comment. On April 14 the Record of Decision was signed by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior. The President's Plan for the Pacific Northwest will be officially in place by May 18. After reviewing thousands of comments, the Team made some changes, but nothing really significant changed between the draft and the final. The timber sale quantity is still 1.1 million board feet in Oregon and California. One change is that the draft talked about plans for forest reserves, now there will be an

assessment first. The Record of Decision has gone to Judge Dwyer. The President's Plan has 3 components: Old-Growth Forests, Interagency Coordination (Regional Interagency Executive Committee ((RIEC)), PIEC, LIIT, etc), and Economic Assistance to Timber Dependent Communities. The main features as far as fisheries and watersheds go are to have large refugia for fisheries (e.g. key watersheds) and a watershed analysis will be required before actions in key watersheds. Other features are riparian protection in key watersheds and late successional reserves. The existing Forest Service and BLM plans will be revised to encompass the President's Forest Plan. There is a potential for legal action that could tie up implementation of this plan. This legal action could come from one side, or the other, or both. Everyone is hoping for some basis of cooperation. The emphasis in the plan is for fisheries and stocks at risk. Ecosystem analysis is based on watershed boundaries. There are fifteen pilot watersheds in California, Oregon and Washington that will be used first, then the activities will continue in other key watersheds. All of these projects take us closer to the desired future condition.

The scope of PACFISH goes beyond the scope of the President's Plan. The EA has been distributed and comments are due May 9. The EA will expand the guidelines in Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT).

Shake: The real task before us is to move the process from just federal lands to include private lands as well. The key to watershed restoration is not just species specific but encompasses ecosystem perspectives. We need such things as pre-listing agreements and other up-front protection actions.

32. Task Force discussion of potential interface between fishery restoration programs and the Forest Plan process.

Holder: The Klamath Watershed is a province. It is a bit confusing because we are all still trying to figure out how all this coordination should occur. We are still working on the answers to the following questions: Is there one PIEC over the state or three? How can we avert the need for species listing? The concept is that there will be a number of teams that will coordinate concerns. At our next meeting, we hope to have a workshop to refine and define roles. Until the roles are official, we will have an excellent opportunity to work on coordination.

Lewis: The PIEC is still evolving. The mandate to date is to first meet the goal of getting the Jobs in the Woods process in place. Since there are members of these new groups that are members of the Klamath's groups, we have some coordination underway already.

Holder: The PIEC has had three meetings. The fourth one is coming up. Key decisions are being made. Organization and definition of job is still occurring.

Shake: Klamath Restoration Program's teams exist, roles will need to be defined. Local people are concerned that this whole process is going to beef up government and not get any money to local people. It is a real opportunity

for watershed restoration if we don't get wrapped up in the bureaucratic process. Tribal involvement is on the fringe, we need to make sure that the tribes have the opportunity to be individually involved.

Holder: In California, all tribes are invited as full members of the RIEC.

Orcutt: There have been so many meetings to go to that our staff is stretched thin. There are four distinctly different tribes and aboriginal territories in the Klamath Watershed. The government to government relationship between these tribes is still being developed. The Endangered Species Act did not kick in overnight, the problem with species decline has been brewing for a long time too. I fully agree that people who are affected by reductions in fish and wildlife population decline need to be involved -- for example, there is a 70% unemployment rate on the Hoopa Reservation.

Elliott: Has all of this translated into any extra bodies employed by the USFS?

Holder: No, and the USFS will not expand. We are in the process of downsizing and we use very few temporaries now. Instead, we are accomplishing the work in different ways: equipment rentals, work agreements, etc. We are holding on to minimum levels of staff right now. It has been a real effort to get the work done with reduced staff and under a short time frame. We feel good about the ability of local people to perform contracts. It is not a great deal of money. The Klamath National Forest will be doing \$820,000 of local contracts in the restoration watersheds. Jobs in the Woods is just 1/3 to 1/2 of what we are doing in our normal course of work.

Shake: Are those proposals compatible with the Klamath Restoration Program's Long Range Plan?

Holder: Proposals are developed with lots of local involvement. KRFR staff (Iverson and Parker) assisted watershed assessment teams with the priorities in the Long Range Plan. The language in the proposals does not exclude fishermen. There are a number of ways for people to become employed (e.g. the community development process, etc).

Public comment

Mike Cozu, resident of Brookings: Looking at this from the outside, with this new law, why are the old organizations still leading? If USFS and CDFG are doing their job there shouldn't be a need for new organizations. I counted 9-10 agencies who would be involved in the Brookings area. Is there a possibility that the Task Force and Klamath Council could combine into a key organization to clean up the Klamath River?

Holder: I don't believe that any of these agencies are staffing-up in order to meet the mandates of the President's Plan. It is the same people with more coordination. BLM and USFS are down sizing. There has got to be a way to make managing natural resources more efficient.

Lara: We may be missing the boat. We could become more efficient in becoming more involved in these processes. The Task Force as a whole should become involved in this process rather than creating new agencies.

Shake: To dissolve this body and put it into a Provincial Team would take Congressional action (although it is a possibility). It will be an adaptive process in which we will work together.

Jim Welter, Brookings: I am concerned with management of the public's renewable resources. I would like to ask you to look at the progress that this group has made since it was established. Water is over-appropriated up and down the coast. Please write me a little summary telling me what this group has accomplished.

[KRFRO will mail him a copy of the annual Accomplishment Report]

Lane: On the Trinity side, we are trying to integrate with the President's Plan by reviewing the budget and returning excess money. We are also working with the USFS to do watershed analysis as early as possible.

34. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments relative to interaction with the Forest Plan process

Shake: This item needs to be on every one of our Task Force agendas. In addition, folks on the Provincial team need to have information on what is going on with our program. We need to make sure we have our foot in the door so that we stay as part of the process.

Orcutt: In November there was a conference call coordinated by Cottingham. This is the type of information exchange that should continue.

Holder: The PIEC will have an agenda, minutes and a mailing list so that is one way to coordinate. There will soon be discussions to identify restoration opportunities that will be opportunities for direct interface with the Klamath Restoration Program. This can be done on a provincial basis.

Bulfinch: The problem seems to be that the President's Plan extends to the entire system, but right now it is only funded on federal lands. The Klamath Task Force is species specific yet the funding applies to private and federal lands. The function of the Task Force is to see what can be done to assist private people to do restoration work. Input, direction and advice to-and-from the various Coordination Resource Management Plan's (CRMP) is essential. The President's Plan may eventually get to private lands, but we can't wait too long.

Shake: We can make sure that our staffs, tribes, and individual organizations are on the mailing lists and attend meetings to stay up-to-date on this developing process.

break

20. Report and recommendations of the upper basin ad hoc committee

Parker: George Thackeray asked me to give this report since I am the staff person assigned to this committee. The Upper Basin Ad Hoc Committee met on March 21-22 at my office in Yreka. Present were Thackeray, Orcutt, Wilkinson, Crawford, Lewis, Zepponi, Vogel, Miller, Kucera and myself. First we reviewed the background for why we were meeting (Handout N), then we clarified our group's objectives. These included: discuss what an amendment means, decide if an amendment should be added, propose options for membership, review the sixteen issues, and decide on a process to proceed with an amendment. We met all of these objectives except for reviewing the sixteen issues. The following decisions were reached by consensus: proceed with an amendment (targeting June as a completion date), a course of action, and membership (Modoc representation can stay as "pending" until legislative action provides a seat). The course of action is: 1) Klamath County, Modoc County and Klamath Tribe will take the lead in resolving the sixteen issues and providing a revised draft, 2) ERO and KRFRD will help facilitate, 3) the revised draft will be brought to a Upper Basin Subcommittee meeting (scheduled for June 9), and 4) the subcommittee will make a presentation to the Task Force on their progress at the June 22-23 meeting in Yreka. The goal is to have the amendment ready for adoption in June. If the amendment is not prepared by June, then the leads (Klamath County, Klamath Tribe and Modoc County) will get it done by October. If you have any questions about our meeting, please ask committee members present today (e.g. Orcutt or Wilkinson).

Orcutt: I'd like to thank staff for helping the process move forward. I feel hopeful about where we stand on this issue now.

** Motion (Orcutt): The ad hoc committee on the Upper Basin Amendment recommends that the Klamath Task Force seat representatives from the Klamath Tribe and Klamath County on the Task Force.

Seconded (Wilkinson).

Discussion

Wilkinson: Expansion of Task Force membership will occur on the adoption of the Upper Basin amendment, preferably at the June meeting or not later than the fall meeting. Modoc County folks will approach getting a seat through legislative action. Funding for upper basin projects can occur.

Orcutt: There is a firm commitment by our group to adopt a revised amendment in June or at least by October. One item that the upper basin amendment should have is guidance on the reintroduction of anadromous fish in the upper basin.

Holder: A number of us didn't feel we are ready to pass a motion on reintroduction of anadromous fish at this time. We need to first have communication with the public.

Hillman: I express my appreciation to the people who sit on the ad hoc committee -- you did a good job. I support the motion. After we seat the new members, I'd like to take it one step further and provide for the reintroduction of anadromous fish to the Upper Klamath Basin as one of the long term goals of the Klamath Restoration Program.

Bulfinch: A policy in the Long Range Plan calls for reviewing the Klamath Restoration Program in '95. Some of the points of difference between the amendment and the plan could be put into one revision by October.

Wilkinson: Our subcommittee's products of consensus are a serious attempt to provide a revision of the amendment by the June meeting.

Bulfinch: I support the motion as offered if another motion can be added for revision of the Long Range Plan in '95.

Hillman: Have the time lines been set for the '95 review of the Long Range Plan? I don't want to tie the upper basin amendment to something that isn't firmed up.

Shake: Program review will come up as an agenda item in '95 then a work group will be assigned to this task. I support the motion, although I would rather see our group make a decision on the amendment at our fall meeting rather than trying to squeeze it into the June meeting. Also, a decision can not be made until the upper basin folks have another public meeting. Perhaps an ad hoc meeting could be held in Klamath Falls prior to the fall Task Force meeting. If this motion passes, then upper basin representatives will be seated by our June meeting.

22. Public comment

Jim Welter: The Upper Basin is half of the drainage of the Klamath River. I would support the motion.

John Crawford, Ad Hoc Committee member from Modoc County: We had held another meeting, and put together a slightly different version of this motion (ie more wording on the adoption of the amendment).

Dave Solem, Klamath County representative on Ad Hoc committee: I wasn't able to attend the March 21-22 meeting, so I sent Rod Kucera as my alternate. I still have problems deciding if this is a stand-alone document or if it changes wording in the Long Range Plan.

Wilkinson: The issues in the Long Range Plan that affect the amendment are items that, if not resolved by ad hoc committee, will be brought forward for Task Force review. The first flagged issue is whether the document is part of or separate from the Long Range Plan.

Miller, Klamath Tribe: We have done a lot of work on the ad hoc committee, it has been a lot of debate. The motion needs to include that the ad hoc committee should still try to deliver a draft document to you in June, then

hopefully by the October meeting the Task Force can decide on any outstanding issues.

**** Action:** We will look forward to seeing the draft document in June. Then we will hold a public comment period prior to the October meeting.

Unidentified speaker: Water is necessary for fish so we need to have offstream storage. We have only had one year in the last six years that has even had an adequate amount of water available.

Todd Kepple, Klamath Falls Herald and News: If the ad hoc committee is successful in completing a draft by the June meeting, will the Task Force open up a formal public comment period?

Shake: Yes, we will accept public comment during the June meeting. The amendment will not be adopted until after public comment is consolidated and added to it.

Dorothy Kandra: I need a complete set of minutes from these meetings. We need to communicate carefully as we have a lot of the state watching us.

[KRFRO will send a full copy of the February and April minutes to Kandra. We will also send copies of full minutes to ERO (Lewis) for distribution to upper basin interests.]

23. Action

Motion re-stated: The Task Force agrees to the following: 1) seat Klamath Tribe and Klamath County on Task Force at the June meeting, 2) the original Long Range Plan will not be expanded into the Upper Klamath Basin, 3) expansion of the Klamath Restoration Program will occur upon adoption of the amendment, which will preferably happen at the June meeting, or no later than the October meeting.

**** Consensus.

24. Report on the status of Fiscal Year 1994 restoration projects (continued)

Iverson: NCIDC recently notified us that a different combination of projects could be considered to replace the two projects that were reviewed, ranked then approved for funding as part of the FY94 federal workplan. We have not yet seen a revised Scope of Work, so we can't go forward with the agreement until we have that revised document. The quandary we are in is that these two projects constitute most of our grant money, yet we don't have a revised Scope of Work to write an agreement for them. Since the revisions are major, the Task Force needs to accept or reject the re-modelled projects. The new projects consist of production and maintenance as opposed to the original projects which were purely production.

Franklin: There are two problems here: 1) there have been logistical problems between the four agencies involved with these projects, so the

revised Scope of Work has not yet been developed, and 2) broodstock needed for the rearing project is simply not available. I understand that funds could still be re-directed to encompass the program.

McInnis: It seems to me that it is too early to decide. The TWG could review the proposed changes first, then get back to us with their recommendation.

Hillman: Both of NCIDC's proposed projects are ongoing and require 12 month commitments. The new projects should just be a modification to an agreement that is already in place.

Shake: I am not prepared to make a decision without something in writing in front of me. Ron will provide us with NCIDC's revised Scope of Work so that we can look at it prior to the June Task Force meeting.

Terry Coltra, NCIDC: (Provides revised draft agreement).

Shake: We can't decide this issue today. Task Force will meet by telephone conference on May 4, to address this matter.

Public comment

Diane Higgins, contractor developing Klamath River Educational Program: I would like to request an additional \$2,500 to fund a field trip for Eureka High School students to travel into the Upper Klamath Basin to see the water and fishery management issues first hand.

Paula Yoon, sub-contractor: If I had known that this field trip project would have developed to the point that it has, I would have requested the funding last year. It became clear to me when I went to the Upper Basin, that the this perspective is missing -- the students from the lower area need to serve as ambassadors to the upper area. The high school group is really moving forward with their activities on this issue (e.g. they have given a lot of presentations, including a national paper presentation).

Orcutt: I think the Task Force's long term contribution to educational projects is worthwhile. Presentations need to be factual -- In the future I would be willing to help insure that Native American issues are clarified through me ahead of time.

Yoon: Since February, the students clarified and revised the slide program with the comments they received.

Hillman: The student's presentation was heartwarming and good. It also touched on tough issues. It was good to have the kids say it as it is. I stand behind this effort.

Higgins: The kids had tried to make the slide program as accurate as possible.

** Motion (Wilkinson): Make \$2,500 available to Higgins/Yoon to fund an educational field trip into the Upper Basin.

Seconded.

Discussion

- o This isn't the first time that proponents have come to us outside the process to ask for funding. I'm concerned that people who submitted proposals that fell below the line aren't frustrated by these out of process requests (Holder).
- o It seems like projects like this that are specific to the Upper Basin should be approved only after the new (Klamath Co and Klamath Tribe) members are present.
- o The proposal calls for taking the slide show on the road. Could it also be provided to us so that we could take it on the road (Elliott)? Yes (Higgins).

Public comment

Mary Kay Taylor: We in the Upper Basin are very sensitive. We feel that the curriculum is biased and feel that the students are not seeing the whole picture. The Task Force should do the on-the-ground work to restore the fisheries before teaching children about fish.

Dorothy Kandra: Paula asked for my assistance to put a group together to help identify issues for the display on the upper basin. We met and discussed some ideas.

Dave Zepponi, Klamath Water Users Protective Association: I don't believe that we ever saw the request for proposals (RFP).

Q: Can we get on the mailing list?

A: Wesemann: Sure, we will put you on the RFP list. I'm surprised that you hadn't seen the RFP -- we mailed it to 600 people. 95 media contacts received press releases on this proposal request too.

Q: Since the Task Force now includes representatives from the Upper Basin, can we submit proposals for funding? If so, when are they due?

A: Parker: Proposals were due April 14, 1994. If you provide us with 26 copies of your proposal by May 1 we will mail them to the TWG for review with the rest of the set of proposals.

Shake: If anybody is not receiving information they need, please contact the KRFRO. We'll mail something to you whenever you ask.

**** Consensus.

35. Set date and location for next meetings

We will have a conference call on May 4 to address the revision of NCIDC's Scope of Work for their projects.

We will meet June 22-23 in Yreka for workplan development.

Our fall meeting will be October 13-14 in Klamath Falls.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
April 19-20, 1994
Brookings, Oregon

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force members present:

Kent Bulfinch	Calif. In-River Sport Fisheries
Rich Elliott	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Barbara Holder	U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
Ron Iverson	U. S. Dept. of Interior
(for Bill Shake who arrived later)	
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Tribe
(for Walt Lara who arrived later)	
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Michael Orcutt	Hoopa Indian Tribe
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

Attendees:

LeRoy Bovey	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Chip Bruss	OSCFI
Mike Cosgrove	Klamath Basin Water Users Protective Association
John Crawford	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Jim Craig	Tulelake I.D.
Earl Danosky	
Carl Fargo	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Gary Hagedorn	
Diane Higgins	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game
Paul Hubbell	Port of Brookings
Robert Jones	Women for Agriculture
Dorothy Kandra	Herald & News
Todd Kepple	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Chuck Lane	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Steve Lewis	Klamath Tribes
Elwood Miller	Pacific Power and Light
Tim O'Connor	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Tricia Parker	Klamath National Forest
Julie Perrochet	Calif. Dept. of Fish & Game
Michael Rode	Self
Reu Raup	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Mike Ryan	Snug Harbor
Freda Shetsma	Klamath Management Zone Coalition
Fred Schutt	Klamath County
David Solem	FB, WFA, SCS
Mary Taylor	

Attendees Continued:

Paul Tschirky
Jim Waldvogel
Bev Wesemann
Jim S. Welter
John Wilson
Paula Yoon
David Zepponi

Tulelake Grange
Klamath River TF-Technical Advisory Team
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
KFMZ Coalition
Klamath River Technical Advisory Team
Fisheries Focus
Klamath Basin Water Users Protective Association

revised 4/2/94

FINAL AGENDA

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

19-20 April 1994

Brookings Inn, Brookings, OR

APRIL 19

- 10:00 1. Convene meeting: opening remarks, introductions.
- 10:15 2. Discussion/adoption of agenda.
- 10:30 3. Correction/approval of minutes from February 1994 meeting.
- 10:45 4. Report of the Bureau of Reclamation on 1994 Klamath River water outlook and operational plans (Mike Ryan).
- 11:15 5. Report of Pacific Power on 1994 operating plans (Bruce Eddy).
- 11:35 6. Report on effects of 1994 water operations on endangered species (Fish & Wildlife Service).
- 11:55 7. Report of California Department of Fish and Game on planned releases from Iron Gate Hatchery (Rich Elliott).
- 12:15 Lunch
- 1:15 8. Report of fishery agencies on their perspectives on 1994 Klamath River operation: Official responses to water management proposals; fish outmigration monitoring plans; other planned actions (All involved tribes and agencies).
- 2:15 9. Task Force discussion of 1994 Klamath River water operations.
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 10. Public comment.
- 3:30 11. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments related to 1994 Klamath River water operations.
- 4:00 12. Report from the Klamath Fishery Management Council on 1994 salmon harvest management: estimated chinook and coho stock abundance; measures taken to protect depleted natural stocks; anticipated

harvests of Klamath fall chinook; anticipated spawning escapements. (Keith Wilkinson).

- 4:30 13. Task Force discussion.
- 5:00 14. Public comment.
- 5:15 15. Action: Task Force decisions, assignments, and advice to the Klamath Council.
- 5:45 Recess

APRIL 20

Reconvene

- 8:00 16. Report on the Klamath Symposium (George Kautsky).
- 8:10 17. NEPA coordination between Trinity River restoration/flow evaluation efforts and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Tom Stokely).
- 8:30 18. Report on the March 23 meeting of Four Chairs, and follow-up meeting on Trinity Restoration Program extension (Bill Shake).
- 8:50 19. Report of the ad hoc committee to draft a letter of support for Trinity program extension (Tom Stokely).
- 9:00 20. Report and recommendations of the upper basin ad hoc committee (George Thackeray).
- 9:30 Break
- 9:45 21. Task Force discussion, items 18 through 20.
- 10:15 22. Public comment.
- 10:30 23. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments relative to items 18 through 20.
- 11:30 24. Report on status of Fiscal Year 1994 restoration projects (Steve Lewis, Ron Iverson, Rich Elliott, Barbara Holder).
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 25. Task Force discussion.
- 1:30 26. Public comment.

- 1:45 27. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments relative to FY 1994 projects.
- 2:00 28. Status of FY 1995 restoration program planning (Lewis, Iverson, Elliott, Holder).
- 2:30 29. Public comment.
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 30. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments relative to FY95 restoration program planning (including scheduling of meetings to review and rank proposals)..
- 3:30 31. Update on the Forest Plan process: Final supplemental EIS and Record of Decision; Klamath Province Team; watershed analysis; Pacfish, and more (Barbara Holder).
- 4:00 32. Task Force discussion of potential interface between fishery restoration programs and the Forest Plan process.
- 4:30 33. Public comment.
- 4:45 34. Action: Task Force decisions and assignments relative to interaction with the Forest Plan process.
- 5:15 35. Review assignments, identify agenda items for June meeting, set date and location for fall meeting.
- 5:30 Adjourn

TASK FORCE MEETING HANOUTS
April 19-20, 1994

Agendum #4

Handout A

Klamath Project Operations for the 1994 Water Year, Bureau of Reclamation, April 19, 1994.

Handout B

Upper Klamath Lake Release Schedule -- Modified flows to enhance fisheries, Bureau of Reclamation, April 6, 1994.

Handout C

Report of California Department of Fish and Game on planned releases from Iron Gate Hatchery, April 19-20, 1994

Handout D

Funding of Fish Trapping Facilities on Klamath River, CDFG, April 4, 1994.

Agendum #8

Handout E

Need for Review of Instream Flow Releases from Iron Gate Reservoir, Yurok Tribe to Bureau of Reclamation, April 18, 1994.

Agendum #16

Handout F

Summary of Klamath Symposium

Agendum #17

Handout G

Action Alert: The Trinity River Need Your Help, Friends of the Trinity River

Agendum #18

Handout H

Matrix of 5 possible alternatives for re-drafting Trinity legislation and excerpt of four items that the Trinity Task Force recommends for the new legislation.

Agendum #19

Handout I

Draft letter to Secretary of Interior

Agendum #24

Handout J

Status of 1993/1994 Klamath Basin Fishery Restoration Projects that Received State Funding, April 12, 1994.

Handout K

Status of FY94 Federally funded projects

Handout L

Projects funded by the Klamath Basin ERO

Handout M

Letter to Task Force from Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, January 25, 1994.

Agendum #20

Handout N

Synopsis of the major events that have occurred in the Klamath River Fishery Restoration Program.

KLAMATH BASIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION OFFICE
FY 1994 RESTORATION PROJECTS

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>AGENCY/GROUP</u>	<u>AMOUNT FUNDED</u>
UPPER BASIN		
1. Mosquito Riparian Fencing and Crossing Restoration	Chemult RD	35,000.00
2. Wood River Erosion Control	BLM	29,000.00
3. Dam's Meadow Integrated Resource Project	Chiloquin RD	8,400.00
4. Klamath Tribe Native Fish Species Hatchery	Klamath Tribe	20,000.00
5. Tulana Watershed Enhancement Project	Tulana Farms	21,500.00
6. Wingwatchers-Lake Ewauna Wetland Restoration	Wingwatchers	10,000.00
7. Townsend's Big-eared Bat Habitat Protection Project	BLM	10,000.00
8. Hayden Creek Exclosure Fence	BLM	8,000.00
9. Sheepy West-Miller Lake Wetland Restoration	FWS	45,200.00
10. Tule Lake Marsh Improvements	FWS	30,000.00
11. Boles Creek Drainage-Riparian Fencing & Water Development	Doublehead RD	75,000.00
12. Willow & Cottonwood Propagation Project	Doublehead RD	3,000.00
13. Mammoth Allotment Riparian Fencing & Water Development	Doublehead RD	40,000.00
14. Enterprise Irrigation District-Northend Conservation Project	Enterprise Irr. Dist.	25,000.00
15. Clear Lake Trespass Livestock Exclusion	FWS	54,000.00
16. Ferguson (Campbell/Bennett) Fencing & Riparian Improvement	Klamath Water Users	5,000.00
17. Gould Fencing & Riparian Improvement	Klamath Water Users	20,000.00
18. Rabe Fencing & Riparian Improvement	Klamath Water Users	32,000.00
19. Lynne Cabral Fencing & Riparian Improvement	Klamath Water Users	27,350.00
20. Spencer Creek Restoration	Klamath RD	34,000.00
21. SWCD/SCS	Klamath County	140,000.00

22.	Klamath Tribe Projects	Klamath Tribe	75,000.00
-----	------------------------	---------------	-----------

LOWER BASIN

1.	Beaver Creek Restoration Project	Oak Knoll RD	149,250.00
2.	French Creek Watershed Granitic Erosion Control	Siskiyou Resource Cons. District	110,000.00
3.	Indian Creek Terrace & Riparian Re-establishment	Happy Camp RD	21,000.00
4.	Shasta River Valley Ecosystem Restoration	Dept. of Fish & Game	80,000.00
5.	Eckstrom Fencing Management Project	Great Northern Corp.	9,000.00
6.	Grider Creek Side Channel	Oak Knoll RD	18,590.00
7.	Grouse Creek Stabilization	Oak Knoll RD	8,260.00
8.	Humburg Creek Refugium	Oak Knoll RD	9,770.00
9.	Linguist Planting	Oak Knoll RD	4,570.00

H:\data\public\ero\akimi.prj

KLAMATH BASIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION OFFICE
RESTORATION PROJECTS NOT FUNDED IN FY 94

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>AGENCY/GROUP</u>	<u>AMOUNT FUNDED</u>
1. Aspen Willow Planting	BLM	5,200.00
2. Riverbank Restoration & Stabilization ...Lower Sprague	Dr. Greg Harris	9,455.00
3. Bald Eagle Habitat Enhancement	BLM	15,000.00
4. Closure of Excess Roads	BLM	30,000.00
5. Lupine Seed Collection for Replanting	Winema FS	9,902.00
6. Mosquito & Skookum Meadow Restoration	Chemult FS	57,282.00
7. Odessa Boat Ramp Reconstruction	Klamath RD	16,250.00
8. Reintroducing Fire In Ecosystem	Klamath RD	26,900.00
9. Restoration of Barren Areas Along Lakeshores of Mtn. Lakes & Sky Lake Wilderness	Klamath RD	46,988.00
10. Road Closure & Obliteration	BLM	29,150.00
11. Seven Mile Canal Restoration	Klamath Tribe	600,000.00
12. Spring Reconstructions (Boundry, Wilshire Springs & Dry Meadow)	Chemult FS	3,860.00
13. Temporary Fencing (Dry Meadow, Rider's Camp, Jack & Sproats Creek Meadows)	Chemult FS	12,761.00
14. Wood River Gap Fencing	BLM	1,000.00
15. Wood River Restoration	Klamath Tribe	400,000.00
16. Mill Creek Watershed Restoration	Hoop Valley Tribe	none id.
17. Pine Creek Watershed Restoration	Hoop Valley Tribe	none id.
18. Reintroducing Fire In the Eco-system: Crater Lake Nat'l Park	Crater Lake Nat'l Park	26,900.00

DRAFT NOTES
KLAMATH FISHERIES TASK FORCE

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE, 4 MAY 1994

The conference call was initiated at 10 a.m. A quorum of Task Force members were present (see Attachment 1, attendance roster). Jerry Grover acted as chair, representing Bill Shake. To conform to FCC requirements, members confirmed they understood their comments would be recorded.

Background on the issue was provided in the conference call notice to Task Force members, dated 26 April 1994. Purpose of the telephone conference was for the Task Force to act on proposed changes in the scope of work for project 94-FR-2, propagation of fall chinook salmon on the Yurok Reservation. That is, proposed changes could be accepted, or not. If accepted, the changes would be incorporated in an agreement for FY94 work. If not, funds that would have been used for the new work items would be available to be obligated for something else. Grover pointed out that the Task Force would not have to identify specific alternate uses for the funds today -- that could be done later. Additional background provided during the conference call:

Terry Coltra, NCIDC: The only real change we propose in our revised FY94 scope of work is to reprogram some funds budgeted for fish rearing to rehabilitation of the rearing facilities. The other change from the original scope of work is inclusion of broodstock collection in fall 1994. While that task was not reviewed by the technical work group and Task Force, it is simply a continuation of the way funding of the rearing projects has been done for the past two years: any surplus funds may be carried over for collection of broodstock for the next rearing cycle. This enables NCIDC to get reimbursed for broodstock collection without waiting for the next contracting cycle. The front-loading of funds for broodstock collection was worked out by Doug Alcorn and Bill Risling, former NCIDC director.

Q: Has the Task Force approved 1994 broodstock collection?

Iverson: There is nothing wrong with providing funds in one fiscal year for broodstock collection in the following fiscal year. The only problem we have in proceeding with this agreement is that we have no record that the Task Force ever approved 1994 broodstock collection, and we don't, normally, fund work that the Task Force hasn't recommended.

Q: How many fish are being reared, and where is this project in its five-year plan?

Hillman: Last year, CDFG told us of the new Fish and Game Commission requirement for five-year plans for fish rearing projects. We met with Region 1 staff to discuss this project. Don Weidlein said CDFG was preparing a plan format, and that we would receive that by the end of 1993. We have not received it, and understand the State is still considering what the plans should contain.

Coltra: In the lower Klamath project, we have a little over 47,000 fish at High Prairie Creek, and less than 1,000 at Cappell Creek.

Hillman: about 38,000 at Camp Creek, under the mid-Klamath rearing project.

Bulfinch: My concerns: (1) At a 4% return rate, the rearing of those 47,000 juveniles would cost us about \$87 per adult -- doesn't seem cost-effective; (2) gill netting of broodstock in the main river may kill so many adults that losses outweigh the benefits; (3) What, specifically, are the proposed facility repairs? (4) Our approval of 1994 broodstock collection now implies approval of the whole 1994-95 rearing project, which would take a big part of available funds. I'm reluctant to endorse this with no technical work group review.

Hillman, in response: This project has had that technical review in past rearing cycles. The concerns about broodstock capture have been dealt with by the work group. The issue today is simply to deal with a routine change in the scope of work, which is only an issue because the Yreka field office hasn't gotten the agreement completed. If it were completed, these changes could be handled through simple budget modifications. We don't need to go back and rehash the technical merits of the project. The project was simply not able to get adequate broodstock, so it is proposed to redirect some rearing funds to facility maintenance.

Grover: I agree -- let's focus on the issue of approving or not approving the proposed changes. What are the repairs that are needed?

Coltra, in response: At Cappell Creek, we have an incomplete facility, lacking weather covers and safety walkways. At High Prairie and Spruce Creek facilities, we have deteriorating facilities needing repair to keep them operating. At Cappell, materials bids are \$3,500 - \$4,100. On the concern about tying the Task Force to a full rearing cycle, we have a disclaimer in the draft agreement that says money will revert back if the 1994-95 rearing project is not approved by the Task Force.

Q: Are facilities temporary, or permanent?

Coltra: Cappell was designed to be permanent.

Hillman: Cappell site was chosen for accessibility and water supply. This facility was intended to supply fish to Pecwan and other streams in the area, where no rearing sites are available. Broodstock were to be captured at the tributaries, fish reared at Cappell, then returned to home tributaries. The Task Force should think in terms of getting full benefit from the investments in these facilities.

Q: Total cost of repairs?

Coltra: \$4,100 at Cappell, \$3,900 at Hunter...\$15,480 total for materials and labor.

Q: In the memo we got, there was mention of \$38,000. Are we now down to \$15,480?

Coltra: That's for repairs. Iverson included the 1994 broodstock capture in coming up with the \$38,000. We consider that to simply be a routine part of this project, and not a new item.

Q: Surplus funds are available because of a broodstock shortage?

Coltra: Correct. We don't have enough juveniles to justify operating the Cappell complex.

Q: If you had gotten enough eggs to use up your funds for rearing, would you have brought the facilities repair to the Task Force for funding as a new, separate, project?

Coltra: Yes, or sought some other funding source. Need for repairs is critical to save the facilities and meet OSHA safety requirements. We see the repairs as meeting the same intent as the rearing work that the Task Force has already approved.

Q: Did the Task Force fund construction of these facilities?

Hillman: In past years, the Task Force has funded construction at small scale rearing facilities. Example: Orleans Rod & Gun Club steelhead facility. We have also funded maintenance.

Q: Would this project be jeopardized if we used the surplus funds for other purposes, and considered the rehab work in the next budget cycle?

Iverson: Typically, projected funds surpluses are estimated at the June Task Force meeting, and may be directed to some of the higher-ranking projects approved for the upcoming fiscal year. For FY94, the Task Force decided last June that any surplus funds would go to the education project proposed by Diane Higgins. We have identified about \$40,000 available for that project, which was budgeted for about \$51,000...so theoretically, the next dollar of surplus funds ought to go to that education project. On the other

hand, Higgins told us she does not intend to perform the "program evaluation" part of that project, so does not need full funding. So, unless the Task Force wants somebody else to do that task, the next project in line to get surplus FY94 funds would be whatever high ranking FY95 project the Task Force may identify for early funding.

Farro: Have you submitted a proposal for the next rearing cycle? If we approve funding now for 1994 broodstock collection, wouldn't we be acting on a proposal that would normally go through the technical review process, for FY95?

Coltra: We have submitted a proposal for FY95 funding.

Hillman: Work on 1994 broodstock collection will have taken NCIDC thousands of dollars in the hole before FY95 funds become available.

Coltra: We worked out this forward-funding cycle with the Yreka office, in prior years...worked it out with Doug Alcorn. If you don't approve the 1994-95 rearing, the money would come back to you. If you do, we would have the funds available for broodstock capture. Right now, we are \$150,000 in the hole on this project.

Farro: Having operated projects like this one at about one-third of the cost, I can't see how you could get so far behind. Given the \$38,000 surplus as a result of your not meeting egg take goals, is the Fish and Wildlife Service making an adjustment for your not meeting your contract? In past years, how were surplus funds spent when egg take was less than projected?

Coltra: We can't control broodstock availability...and the amount in question is \$15,000, not \$38,000.

Farro: Sorry to hear the facilities are in such poor shape, after all the hundreds of thousands of dollars we have put into this project.

Coltra: This is not the fault of NCIDC, but of "previous operators", who allegedly budgeted money for improvements, but used it for other purposes.

Farro: To save us time, I will say now I oppose the proposed changes. Who originated the \$38,000 figure?

Iverson: That's my figure, arrived at as follows: Facility repair is estimated by NCIDC at about \$15,000. I estimated the cost of 1994 broodstock collection at \$23,000 by averaging the costs from the two prior years when that task was a separately-budgeted project. These are the two tasks that, according to our records, the Task Force has not approved.

Farro: I would like to see all this reviewed by the technical work group, to see if it stands on its own merits.

Grover: Is that a motion?

**** Farro: Move to reject the proposed changes.

**** Bingham: Second, and offer an amendment that we would hold these funds for a decision on what to do with them at the June meeting, after the 1995 rearing proposal has been through review.

**** Farro: Seems like that is what would happen anyway, but I accept the amendment.

DISCUSSION

Hillman: Does this mean a cooperative agreement would go forward to cover the remainder of the project?

Grover: If the motion passes, I will instruct the field office to write an agreement for the total amount less \$38,000, which would let NCIDC get reimbursed for funds they have already spent. If the Task Force decides, at the June meeting, to fund all or part of the proposed new tasks, then the amount of payment would be increased. We are speaking of the facilities maintenance, and the 1994 broodstock collection.

Coltra: The latter would not be an issue now, if we had had a signed contract.

Iverson: It doesn't matter what stage of contracting we are asked to sign off on, whether a draft agreement, or a modification to a signed agreement. If what is proposed is work that the Task Force has not approved, Bill Shake has not given us the authority to obligate money for that work.

Hillman: The advanced funding of broodstock collection has been done in the past two cycles, so I don't see why it is illegal now, and why it is being brought up for Task Force action.

Coltra: Just having come into this job, I assumed it is the normal process to fund next year's broodstock collection.

Bulfinch: Too bad we didn't start out viewing this as a multi-year project.

Elliott: Agree that a five-year plan would be useful, and I commit the Department to assist NCIDC in developing it.

Coltra: we intend to work on the plan in the next few months. Appreciate your help.

***** Action: Motion was re-stated, and no objections were raised.

Bingham: For the technical work group and Task Force review process, it will be helpful to learn the long-term plans NCIDC has for this project.

Meeting adjourned.

ATTENDANCE LIST

KLAMATH TASK FORCE TELECONFERENCE, 4 MAY 1994

Task Force members/alternates:

Nat Bingham

Kent Bulfinch

Rich Elliott

Mitch Farro

Jerry Grover for Bill Shake (chair)

Leaf Hillman

Walt Lara

Jack West for Barbara Holder

Keith Wilkinson

Others:

Terry Coltra

Jim Craig

Bruce Halstead

Ron Iverson

Linda Schwinck